



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,832	05/09/2001	Julian S. Taylor	SMQ-118/P6144	3937
959	7590	04/08/2005	EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109			KHATRI, ANIL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2193		

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/851,832	TAYLOR, JULIAN S.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anil Khatri	2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed on 11/2/2004.

As per applicant's request claims 1-54 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Prinzing USPN 6,496,202*.

In remarks applicant argues,

- I) "Receiving with the user interface module from the application program after reaching the processing point an interaction object specifying data and generating output data to render on the output device from the interaction object" as to claims 1, 19 and 37.
- II) "An interaction object in updating a view and interaction object provided from the controller directly to view both which resides on the user interface module".
- III) "No disclosure on a change to a view made because of direct communications between controller to the view".
- IV) "No disclosure on transmission of an object from outside of the view to the view such as view being capable of modifying itself by using and interaction object and without use of factory or a model".
- V) "Single component including both view and controller in which the controller communicates directly to the view".
- VI) "No disclosure of acquiring user input adding the input into an object or transmitting the object to the model".

VII) "No disclosure of that the model sending an object to the controller for modification and transmission back to the model".

VIII) "Including input from user in a transmission between the controller and the model".

Response to the applicant's arguments,

I) It was noted in the cited reference that GUI have been used in order to send and receive the command and to view the model as depicted in figures 4, 5 and 8 and in abstract. Reference fairly suggests receiving with the user interface module from the application program after reaching the processing point and interaction of objects with specifying data (see column 5, lines 19-27, column 18, lines 42-44). Thus limitations are met by the reference.

II) It was also noted in the reference that updating a view and interaction object provided from the controller directly to view both which resides on the user interface module as depicted in figure 4, column 4, lines 30-35. Therefore, examiner believes that reference fairly suggests that viewing has been facilitated with controller. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

III) Cited reference fairly suggests that the change to a view made because of direct communications between controller to the view has been done by customizing GUI that represents the view in a model, view and with controller architecture see figures 4, 5 and 8. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

IV) It was also noted in the reference and as well with the applicant on remarks' page 14 3rd paragraph line 2 that controller does send a change request to the mode and that transmissions on objects from outside has been done and the view to the view such as view being capable of modifying itself by using and interaction object and without use of factory or a model has been introduced (see column 4, lines 25-35), therefore, reference has fairly suggested that there is

some sort of communication even though model or view has not changed. Therefore, limitations are met by the references.

V) It was also noted that including both view and controller in which the controller communicates directly to the view have been fairly suggested by the reference on column 6, lines 44-55. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

VI) It was fairly suggested in the reference that acquiring user input adding the input into an object or transmitting the object to the model as depicted in figure 4 which allows acquiring input and thru controller changes have been mode into the model. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

VII) It was noted that reference also discloses that model sending an object to the controller for modification and transmission back to the model and figures 5 AB depicts see column 6, lines 49-55. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

VIII) Figures 5 and 8 depicts that there is a transmission between the controller and the model. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil Khatri, Primary Examiner whose telephone number is 571-272-3725. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 571-272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER